UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/908,969	07/18/2001	Robert J. Ternansky	480140.457C1	6932

500 7590 01/26/2004

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER	
LUKTON, DAVID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1653	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/908,969	TERNANSKY ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	David Lukton	1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Dispositi n of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,20 and 26-36* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *2-19 and 21-25* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

Applicants' election of Group I is acknowledged. However, Group II is now rejoined with Group I. Claims 1-36 are examined in this Office action.

*

Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No 6,515,173. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. There is overlap of the claimed genus for the case of $R^{1'}$ representing hydrogen.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application . See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> "Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement therof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 30 recites the term "preventing". Even if one were to stipulate that the claimed compounds can be used to treat the recited diseases, it would still not follow therefrom that actual prevention can be achieved. Prevention means that out of a given population of test subjects, not a single one develops a disease. The bar that must be overcome to demonstrate prevention is quite high, and not even an initial step towards demonstrating this has been undertaken. This particular ground of rejection can be overcome by deleting the term "preventing".

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a well established utility.

Claim 30 is also rejected under 35 USC §112 first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set

forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have shown (table 2, page 65) that the claimed compounds can inhibit one or more caspases. Based on this, applicants are asserting the the claimed compounds can be used to treat any of several diseases including the following: meningitis, salpingitis, septic shock, respiratory diseases, inflammatory conditions, arthritis, cholangitis, colitis, encephalitis, endocerolitis, hepatitis, pancreatitis, reperfusion injury; ischemic diseases such as myocardial infarction, stroke and ischemic kidney disease; hypersensitivity; autoimmune diseases, multiple sclerosis, osteoporosis, Paget's Disease, neurodegenerative disease, Alzheimer's disease, and Parkinson's disease. It is also asserted that the claimed compounds will be effective to repopulate hematopoietic cells following chemo- and radiation therapy and for prolonging organ viability for use in transplantation.

As stated in *Ex parte Forman* (230 USPQ 546, 1986) the factors to consider in evaluating the need (or absence of need) for "undue experimentation" are the following: quantity of experimentation necessary, amount of direction or guidance presented, presence or absence of working examples, nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in

that art, predictability or unpredictability of the art, and breadth of the claims.

Consider the following:

- Frost Robert A. (*American Journal of Physiology. Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology* **283** (3) R698-709, 2002) investigated the regulation of TNFα and IL-6 by lipopolysaccharide (LPS) in C2C12 myoblasts and mouse skeletal muscle. Treatment of myocytes with IL-1 or TNF-alpha also increased IL-6 mRNA content, and the increase in IL-6 mRNA due to LPS could not be prevented by pretreatment with antagonists to either IL -1 or TNF. Thus, even if applicants could successfully block all interleukin-1 production using the claimed compounds, interleukin-6 levels could not be controlled, thereby leading to "unpredictable" results on inflammatory response.

- Meyers K. P. (*Inflammation* **17** (2) 121-34, 1993) discloses that interleukin-1 receptor antagonist was not active as an anti-inflammatory agent in the 24-h pleurisy model (carageenan-induced pleurisy).

- Rosenbaum J. T. (*Archives of Ophthalmology* **110** (4) 547-9, 1992) discloses that interleukin-1 receptor antagonist did not produce significant reduction in inflammation subsequent to an active Arthus reaction or subsequent to the intravitreal injection of 125 ng of endotoxin. Rosenbaum suggests that the failure of IL-1RA to be therapeutically effective may be due in part to the presence of other pro-inflammatory cytokines.

- Brennan (*Clinical and Experimental Immunology* **81**, 278-85, 1990) discloses that TGF-β was effective to inhibit IL-1β production in LPs-stimulated peripheral blood mononuclear cells, but only if the cells were pretreated with TGF-β. The IL-1β production was not inhibited if the TGF-β was applied after the inducing stimulus. The point here is that if a scientist has evidence that a given agent "X" is effective to inhibit production of IL-1β when used prior to stimulation of cells (which stimulation produces the IL-1β), attempting to inhibit production of IL-1β by using agent "X" after stimulation of the cells leads to "unpredictable" results.

- Paris (*Journal of Infectious Diseases* **171**, 161-69, 1995) discloses that IL-1RA was not effective to treat inflammation caused by gram-negative bacteria.

With respect to claim 30, Read S. J. (*Drugs and Aging* **14** (1) 11-39, 1999) discloses (e.g., abstract) that although many drugs are effective in animal models of cerebral ischemia, these drugs have largely failed to fulfill their promise in clinical trials.

Thus, attempting to extrapolate from *in vitro* ICE inhibition to treatment of human disease leads to "unpredictable" results; undue experimentation would be required to practicee the methods of claims 27-36. It is suggested that each of the method-of-use claims be cancelled. Claim 26 is rejected because it recites the term "pharmaceutical". This term carries with it an implied assertion of therapeutic efficacy which is not in evidence. Accordingly, it is suggested that the term "pharmaceutical" be deleted from claim 26.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the possibility exists that the following claim might be enabled (the term "apoptosis" is used on p. 31):

> *A method of inhibiting apoptosis comprising administering to a patient in need thereof a compound according to claim 1 for a time and under conditions effective to inhibit a caspase.*

If such a claim is added, however, it is suggested that applicants provide at least one reference which shows that, at the time of the invention, it was known that caspase inhibitors are effective to inhibit apoptosis.

✧

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached at 571-272-0951. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

DAVID LUKTON
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1600